DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 262 471 EA 018 010

TITLE	The Principal as Change Facilitator. Bulletin 1753.
INSTITUTION	Louisiana State Dept. of Education, Baton Rouge. Louisiana Dissemination Network.
PUB DATE	Jul 85
NOTE	58p.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Responsibility; *Administrator Role; *Change Agents; Change Strategies; Consultants; *Educational Change; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Inservice Education; Leadership Qualities; *Leadership Responsibility; Leadership Styles; Models; *Principals; Program Evaluation; School Supervision

ABSTRACT

This monograph surveys the literature relating to the role of the principal as change agent and the process of educational change, and reviews those characteristics that research has found to make principals more effective and efficient change agents. The introduction identifies four relevant perspectives in the research on instructional leadership: (1) universal leadership traits; (2) leadership styles; (3) conditions under which specific leadership traits are effective; and (4) leadership behaviors. Thereafter, the first section focuses on theories and research pertaining to the process of organizational change and the role of the change facilitator. The second section focuses on the principal as a change facilitator. Research is reviewed on the three change facilitator styles (responders, managers, and initiators, and a discussion follows on how to determine the most effective blend of change facilitator styles. The third section focuses on second change facilitators, including assistant principals, teachers, and consultants. The fourth section reviews the literature on inservice training for principals as change facilitators. Topics discussed include the rationale for inservice training, the climate for change, the change process, change facilitator concerns, and facilitator style. The final section discusses the implications of the principal as change facilitator for school improvement efforts, student achievement, formative and summative program evaluation, personnel evaluation, second change facilitators, inservice education, and placement of personnel. The monograph concludes with a model applying the findings regarding the principal as change agent. A 4-page bibliography is included. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

The Principal as Change Facilitator

ED262471

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Esbarb

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Bulletin 1753

Louisiana Dissemination Network (R&D)
Bureau of Development
Office of Research and Development

July, 1985

Louisiana Department of Education

Thomas G. Clausen, Ph.D.
State Superintendent

EA 018 010

The Principal as Change Facilitator

Bulletin 1753

Louisiana Dissemination Network (R&D)
Bureau of Development
Office of Research and Development

July, 1985

Louisiana Department of Education

Thomas G. Clausen, Ph.D.
State Superintendent

This public document was published at a total cost of $46.30. 100 copies of this public document were published in this first printing at a cost of $46.30. The total cost of all printings of this document, including reprints, is $46.30. This document was published by the Louisiana Department of Education, P. O. Box 94064, Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064 to disseminate information about educational programs in Louisiana under authority of R.S. 17:21, as amended. This material was printed in accordance with the standards for printing by state agencies established pursuant to R.S. 43:31.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
The Change Process and the Change Facilitator	4
Resistance to Change	4
Models for Change	6
The Role of the Change Facilitator	9
The Principal as Change Facilitator	12
Change Facilitator Styles	15
Determining Effective Change Facilitator Style	19
Second Change Facilitators	21
Inservice Training for Principals as Change Facilitators	25
Rationale	25
Climate for Change	29
Change Process	32
Change Facilitator Concerns	35
Facilitator Style	38
Implications	39
School Improvement Efforts	39
Student Achievement	40
Program Evaluation Formative	40
Program Evaluation Summative	41
Personnel Evaluation	42
Second Change Facilitators	42
Inservice Education	43
Placement of Personnel	44
Applying the Findings Regarding the Principal As Change Agent: One Model	45
Providing a Process and Structure for Change	45
Providing an Outside Change Agent	46
Future Plans	47

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

		Page
1.	Summary of Within School Factors Thought to Characterize the Instructionally Effective School	2
2.	Stages of Concern	7
3.	Level of Use of the Innovation	8
4.	A Possible Framework for Identifying Critical Principal Tasks in Facilitating School Change	23
5.	Functions	34
6.	Change Facilitator Stages of Concern	37

The Principal as Change Facilitator

INTRODUCTION

The National Commission on Excellence in Education challenged the people of this country to renew their commitment to educational excellence by reforming the educational system. Whether this report stimulated or resulted from school effectiveness research is debatable because renowned effective school literature both precedes and follows A Nation at Risk (1983).

Regardless of the chronology, however, researchers today take care to translate their findings directly into specific suggestions for improving the climate and productivity of schools and classrooms. For example, there are numerous models concerning the necessary components of school effectiveness. Mann and Lawrence (1981) summarize seven different sets of within-school variables identified by various authorities as factors characterizing the instructionally effective school (Figure 1).

A constant component occurring within a majority of these models is the instructional leader. The literature on school effectiveness consistently identifies the principal as the instructional leader and therefore the key factor in school success.

There have been numerous attempts to isolate the features or characteristics that identify effective leadership and that differentiate them from ineffective leaders. According to Jago (1981), studies of leadership have represented four different perspectives: (1) universal traits, (2) leadership styles, (3) specification of conditions under which certain leader traits are effective, and (4) leadership behaviors.

The first perspective (Type I research) attempted to identify intrinsic qualities or characteristics that are universal leadership traits

Figure 1

SUMMARY OF WITHIN SCHOOL FACTORS THOUGHT TO CHARACTERIZE THE INSTRUCTIONALLY EFFECTIVE SCHOOL

	[illegible]	CLARK LOTTO ASTUTO	VENEZKY WINFIELD	BRIDGE LANDER ANDERT	BACKENFOOD LEGGETTE	AUSTIN	MANNED BY AL.
	(20 Detroit and 9 Lansing Schools: achievement data plus case analysis)	(Secondary analysis of 117 urban education studies plus elite interviews)	(Reading programs of two urban, minority schools, one high, one low achieving)	(Controlled for class. 21 high achieving/low achieving schools)	(6 improving, 3 declining Michigan schools)	(Secondary analysis of 8 RAND studies of "exceptional" schools)	(Re-examination of school effectiveness studies)
(A) Principals' characteristics and behavior	Strong leadership	High expectations	High expectations of reading achievement; high task orientation; works closely with specialists; high risk reading goals.	Directive about decisions, but "supportive" of teachers.	Assertive leader responsible for evaluation of accomplishment of objectives. High expectations of kids.	Strong leadership, observes & teaches high program control, more experience & "persistent" education. High expectations of all.	High expectations; high structure; clear goals.
(B) Teachers' characteristics and behavior	High expectations of childrens' minimum performance.	Staff development programs with specific goals.	Confident, inventive flexible; encourage students, maintain discipline; high staff development; low time on administrative work.	"Task oriented"	High expectations for all kids of beginning and of further academic achievement. Feel responsible for teaching. "Accountable." Less satisfied.	More experience, more "pertinent" education. "Stress high expectations of kids.	High expectations of students; provide structured classroom, emphasize homework.
(C) School climate or atmosphere	Orderly, conducive to learning, quiet.	Structured learning environment	High morale; effective use of praise; focus on student achievement		"Disciplined"		Student discipline and structured learning stressed. "Traditional values" of teaching and learning.
(D) Instructional emphasis	Highest priority to pupil acquisition of basic skills.	Concentration on teaching clear goals.	Highest priority to reading with clear goals; homogeneous groupings for reading; direct centered services, adaptable instruction.	More time to social studies. More whole group instruction.	Emphasis on reading and math. More time invested.	Emphasis on cognitive development. Longer instructional day.	"Strong press for academic excellence." Emphasis on homework and study.
(E) Pupil Evaluation	Frequent	"Individualized instruction"	Closely monitored student progress	Yes	Teachers accept pupil test results as measure of their adult performance.	Teacher-made tests.	Tests closely related to syllabus. Test taking skills stressed.
(F) Resources	Flexible allocations to follow priorities	Small classes, more adults. Outside, extra money.	Availability and coordination of extra personnel, time and materials; supplementary materials.	Many adult volunteers, fewer paid aides. High access to additional materials.	Not high use of paraprofessionals	"Close involvement" of teachers and paraprofessionals with pupils.	"Shared purposefulness" among school persons and home.

Mann, D., & Lawrence, J. (Eds.). *Instructionally Effective Schools.* Impact on Instructional Improvement, 1981, 16 (4), pp. 8-9.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(DeBevoise, 1984). The outcome of many of these studies led Alfonso, Firth, and Neville (1981) to conclude the following:

> ...there is simply no trait or pattern of characteristics common to all leaders. While certain characteristics recur frequently, their positive correlation is low and in themselves they cannot be held to be significant determinants or predictors of the ability to lead. (p. 100)

When research failed to identify the absolute characteristics of effective leaders, studies began to examine the style of leadership: the process involving interaction between leaders and followers. No one style was found to be related reliably to effective leadership; moreover, a number of studies suggested that the context in which a leader operates may influence style as much as style influences the followers (Teddlie, Falkowski, Stringfield, Desselle and Garvue, 1984).

These findings led to the development of the final two perspectives which are based on the premise that leadership depends on the situation. Type III research focuses on the conditions (situational theory) under which certain traits of leaders are effective. Type IV focuses on the situation as well but emphasizes behaviors and/or activities that are associated with effective leadership. Neither of these perspectives, however, has provided the final answer on effective leadership, for while certain behaviors may predict effectiveness in many school environments, they may not be associated with achievement in schools which have radically different climates for learning (Hall, Rutherford, Griffin 1982). Theodore Sizer comments: "What works in A may not work in B. There are a variety of styles that can be effective; it's the match that's important." (De Bevoise, 1984, p.18)

In considering these four perspectives of instructional leadership, one point of relevancy and controversy is the role of the principal and the

process of educational change. This monograph will survey the literature with regard to this point of contention and will review those elements that research has found to make principals more effective and efficient change agents.

THE CHANGE PROCESS AND THE CHANGE FACILITATOR

In comparison with changes in industry, agriculture, and medicine, educational change proceeds slowly. This disparity between the rate of change in education and in other institutions may be explained in part by the facts of education's reliance on people for change and of people's intuitive resistance to change. People do not modify or abort existing patterns of behavior easily. Change denotes uncertainty or venture into the unknown. There is a natural resistance to doing things differently. The problem of change then is more a function of people than it is of technology.

Resistance to Change

The role of a change facilitator is often a difficult and thankless one. According to Gordon Lippitt (CROFT, 1977), behavioral scientist, people resist change because of the following:

- o The purpose of the change is not clear.
- o Those affected by the change were not involved in its planning.
- o The appeal for change is based on personal reasons.
- o The habit pattern of the individuals involved are ignored.
- o Those being asked to make a change are afraid of failure.
- o Excessive pressure to make the change is involved.
- o The personal "cost" (failure) is too high, or the "rewards" are inadequate.
- o There is a lack of trust in and respect for the person(s) attempting to initiate the change.
- o Those being asked to change are satisfied with the status quo. (p.1)

Resistance to change, however, can be overcome. What is required is (1) communication, (2) involvement, and (3) encouragement/support. The purposes of communication are to make the purpose of change clear, to establish an atmosphere of trust, and to present information that demonstrates that the status quo is not satisfactory. Involvement, probably the most effective way to bring about change, helps the participants to understand the purpose of change and to feel ownership for the innovation. Encouragement and support can help by reducing the fear of failure and by increasing the "rewards." Both psychological and physical support and encouragement are needed--praise for a job well done and the supplies/materials needed to support the innovation.

People can and will change if the change facilitator provides the following prerequisite conditions and activities: (Right to Read, nd)

1. A need is established.
2. Change facilitators understand the need.
3. Change facilitators know what is expected of them in the change process.
4. There is an understanding of the benefits to be derived from the change.
5. A change plan is developed.
6. The change plan is gradual.
7. Allowances for trial and error are inherent in the change plan.
8. The implementors are provided with appropriate training and adequate support.
9. The implementors are provided opportunities for feedback and/or reaction to the change plan.

Because schools and school systems are complex social systems, any attempt to change them requires careful analysis. If innovations are to be successful, according to K. George Pedersen and Thomas Fleming of the University of Victoria, (1) effective feedback systems must be developed; (2) the level of commitment of all participants must be fully understood and ensured; and (3) teachers and administrators in many cases must be resocialized. (CROFT, 1977)

Models for Change

There are numerous models for change that attempt to meet these three requirements. For example, Right to Read uses a combination of two change processes developed by Kurt Lewin and Ronald Havelock. Levin's change model has three basic process steps: (1) Unfreezing or creating awareness, (2) Moving Toward or developing and implementing, and (3) Refreezing or maintaining on-going activities to achieve the objectives. The Havelock model is a three-level pyramid: Level I, Creating Awareness; Level II, Obtaining Commitments; and Level III, Personal Involvement.

Another model for change, the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) developed at the University of Texas in Austin, has specific constructs for organizing and analyzing change. As a result of the studies done by the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education (RDCTE), three diagnostic dimensions have been developed to help change facilitators to collect information about the degree of implementation of an innovation: Stages of Concern (SoC), Levels of Use (LoU), and Innovation Configurations. (Figures 2 and 3)

Figure 2

STAGES OF CONCERN:

TYPICAL EXPRESSIONS OF CONCERN ABOUT THE INNOVATION

	STAGES OF CONCERN		EXPRESSIONS OF CONCERN
IMPACT	6	REFOCUSING	I HAVE SOME IDEAS ABOUT SOMETHING THAT WOULD WORK EVEN BETTER.
	5	COLLABORATION	I AM CONCERNED ABOUT RELATING WHAT I AM DOING WITH WHAT OTHER INSTRUCTORS ARE DOING.
	4	CONSEQUENCE	HOW IS MY USE AFFECTING KIDS?
TASK	3	MANAGEMENT	I SEEM TO BE SPENDING ALL MY TIME IN GETTING MATERIAL READY.
SELF	2	PERSONAL	HOW WILL USING IT AFFECT ME?
	1	INFORMATIONAL	I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW MORE ABOUT IT.
	0	AWARENESS	I AM NOT CONCERNED ABOUT IT (THE INNOVATION).

CBAM Project
Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin
(Hall and Rutherford, 1983)

Figure 3

LEVELS OF USE OF THE INNOVATION:

TYPICAL BEHAVIORS

		LEVEL OF USE	BEHAVIORAL INDICES OF LEVEL
	VI	RENEWAL	THE USER IS SEEKING MORE EFFECTIVE ALTERNATIVES TO THE ESTABLISHED USE OF THE INNOVATION.
U	V	INTEGRATION	THE USER IS MAKING DELIBERATE EFFORTS TO COORDINATE WITH OTHERS IN USING THE INNOVATION.
S	IVB	REFINEMENT	THE USER IS MAKING CHANGES TO INCREASE OUTCOMES.
E	IVA	ROUTINE	THE USER IS MAKING FEW OR NO CHANGES AND HAS AN ESTABLISHED PATTERN OF USE.
R	III	MECHANICAL USE	THE USER IS MAKING CHANGES TO BETTER ORGANIZE USE OF THE INNOVATION.
N	II	PREPARATION	THE USER IS PREPARING TO USE THE INNOVATION.
O	I	ORIENTATION	THE USER IS SEEKING OUT INFORMATION ABOUT THE INNOVATION.
N	0	NONUSE	NO ACTION IS BEING TAKEN WITH RESPECT TO THE INNOVATION.
U			
S			
E			
R			

CBAM Project
Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin
(Hall, Loucks, Rutherford and Love, 1975)

The SoC and the correlative LoU can be used to assess the concerns and needs of the staff so that appropriate interventions and training can be provided. The innovation configuration allows the change facilitator to see if the innovation is being used as the developer envisioned. CBAM, then, enables the change facilitator to personalize strategies that enhance the individual user and his effective use of the innovation during the adoption process and thereby shortens the time required to achieve effective use of the innovation.

All three models mentioned attempt to meet the concern of a change facilitator: how to help the user achieve independence as soon as possible so that the user can manage the innovation under his own power and internalize the change within the structure.

These models also reveal that change is a highly complex process and that the success of a proposed change is dependent upon a change facilitator.

The Role of the Change Facilitator

What does the literature say about change facilitators? Havelock has identified three roles for the educational change facilitators:

(1) Catalyst--overcomes inertia, energizes the resources within an institution, examines where it is and where it ought to be

(2) Solution giver--decides when and how to move from status quo to goal achievement

(3) Process helper--recognizes and defines problems, diagnoses problems, sets objectives, acquires relevant resources, selects/creates solutions to problems, adapts/installs solution, evaluates it.

Karen Louis (1979) has identified desirable personal characteristics of effective change facilitators that include the following:

being candid and straight foward,
having tolerance for ambiguity,
having the ability to cope with frustrations,

being concerned and supportive,
being able to trigger enthusiasm,
being tolerant of different views,
being flexible,
being poised and mature,
having political finesse,
having commitment,
having acceptance of constraints,
having motivation and drive,
having interpersonal relationship skills,
having administrative ability, and
having technical qualifications.

Right to Read has identified the seven perspectives that a change facilitator needs to consider:

(1) Social Perspective

The change facilitator must provide participants with social acceptance, emotional security, and moral support prior to and throughout the change process.

(2) Professional Perspective

The change facilitator must assess the competencies of clients and provide adequate training and follow-up to ensure success of the change plan.

(3) Political Perspective

The change facilitator must develop strategies to influence the status quo to support the change plan through verification of the co-joined benefits to be derived and to minimize peer conflict.

(4) Resource Perspective

The change facilitator must provide adequate documentation of resource needs and maintain accurate records to justify absorption of the change plan.

(5) Evaluation Perspective

The change facilitator must provide evaluation systems which assure clients of amnesty from punitive reactions and result in identification of areas in need of improvement.

(6) Linkage Perspective

The change facilitator must be a catalyst for linkage and diffusion to ensure maximizing the outcomes of the change plan.

(7) Consultation Perspective

The change facilitator must be skilled in group processes and know when intervention is necessary to channel behavior toward accomplishment of the change plan.

All of these perspectives, however, would be of little value if the change facilitator did not organize the change process into a manageable sequence of steps in accordance with the peculiarities of the situation. Right to Read lists 11 organizational steps for change facilitators:

(1) identify populations;

(2) conduct needs assessment;

(3) clarify roles and analyze tasks;

(4) build relationships between change facilitators and client system;

(5) establish goals, objectives, and priorities;

(6) assess status of current resources and programs and adjust to accommodate change plan;

(7) design change plan for target population;

(8) design staff development program for client system;

(9) establish linkage system;

(10) implement and stabilize the change plan; and

(11) evaluate and refine plan.

THE PRINCIPAL AS CHANGE FACILITATOR

As innovations in schools and classrooms were studied, it became apparent that teacher reactions to change were not entirely random. They were influenced by the leadership of the building principals. The greater the principal's involvement and commitment, the more consistent was the teacher's use of the innovation. Lieberman and Miller (1981) reinforced this position when they stated "the principal is the critical person in making change happen." (p. 583)

Projects that have the active support of the principal are more likely to succeed. A principal's actions legitimize whether a change is to be taken seriously and serves to support teachers. According to Berman and McLauglin (1978), one of the best indicators of principals' active involvement is whether the principals attended the project workshop sessions with the teachers. Involvement in training of the innovation not only better equips principals to advise teachers but also imparts important messages: (1) The principal is personally committed. (2) The project is a school effort in which everyone is expected to cooperate and work hard. (MacLaughlin and Marsh, 1978)

Hord and Goldstein's in-depth study (1982) of principals as change facilitators offers several generalizations about principals and what they do during the process of implementation of an innovation.

1. Principals tend not to individualize interventions. All teachers receive the same interventions. (Note: Although principals promote attending to individual differences in students, they do not model this theory with regard to individual difference among teachers.)

2. Principals have very few interactions with others outside the school (e.g., parents and community). The majority of their interventions are targeted at the faculty only.

3. Principals' interventions fall mostly within the managerial function.

4. Principals' interventions that would reflect the principal as an effective leader (e.g., training and consultation) account for only one-fifth to one-fourth of their behaviors.

5. The flow of the principals' interventions tend to be one-way and may be a function of principals' styles.

6. Change is a process requiring much time and effort, especially if the innovation is complex and/or requires a great deal of change in teacher practice. A second-year innovation requires as much activity by the principal as a first-year innovation. This is important, then, for principals to recognize. Their role as change facilitators does not end after just one year.

7. Principals appear to select someone else to assist them in the intervention.

8. The face-to-face mode was employed in 80 percent of principals' interventions.

Additional findings about principals as change facilitators are as follows: (The Best of ERIC, 1980)

Change is more likely to occur from administrators who are outsiders rather than insiders.

Experienced elementary school principals were more likely than beginning principals to be classified as change facilitators.

Principals who employed teacher aides were more often viewed as change facilitators.

Principals who were rated as change facilitators reported using to a greater extent three behaviors: (1) seeing change as a group endeavor, (2) rewarding faculty through visible recognition, (3) and systematically evaluating the innovation.

The success of a principal as a change facilitator depends on his knowledge of human behavior and his understanding of how and why people's attitudes change.

The person in charge sets the tone and the method of change. Thus, it is essential for principals to understand the nature and process of change.

When discussing principals as change facilitators we need to consider Daniel Griffith's (1959) concern: the effectiveness of the principal in

promoting change is questionable. Griffith found that conditions in which principals work are not conducive to their taking aggressive leadership since (1) the principals work at a distance from the policy makers and must be aware of their superiors and (2) freedom to fail and freedom to redesign the educational structure are not always permissible. While the NFL expects an excellent quarterback to complete only 50 percent of his passes, the public schools often unrealistically expect administrators always to be successful.

The resurgence of public concern about school effectiveness and the renewed appreciation of the importance of principals have led researchers to examine both principals' behaviors and school effectiveness. Recent findings document what principals already know: (1) their work is characterized by brevity, fragmentation, and variety; (2) daily interactions are mostly unplanned, reactive, and with subordinates; (3) they move through a hectic, unpredictable, and discontinuous work flow; and (4) they prefer oral communication, concrete problems, and specific information (Manasse, 1984).

Research indicates that the difference between average and high-performing principals is that effective principals are proactive. These principals have a sense of purpose and direction provided by a well-developed, clearly stated set of goals. Effective principals involve moving schools toward a vision of what could be rather than maintaining what is. Organizational change research suggests that effective principals need two kinds of vision: (1) a vision of their schools and their role within these schools, and (2) a vision of the change process. Effective principals have a combination of skills: (1) personal vision, (2) information sensing and analysis skills, and (3) interpersonal skills that generate commitment to a

common set of values (Manasse, 1984). These skills, however, may be carried by a variety of change facilitator styles or behaviors.

Change Facilitator Styles

Leithwood found that based on their behaviors effective principals could be grouped into four kinds of leaders, three of which correspond to the effective-ineffective principal research: administrative, facilitative, directive. Of the 27 principals observed, one-half operated as administrators, passive observers of the curricular process who became directly involved only if there were a visible problem. Both facilitative and directive leaders played a leading role in instructional change. The difference between them was that facilitative leaders were more highly involved with teachers and relied on teachers to help influence other teachers. Directive leaders, on the other hand, made decisions and attempted to have teachers follow these decisions. (Fullan, 1980)

Margaret Thomas (1978) concluded that many factors affected implementation, and, of those factors, leadership of the principal appeared to be one of the most important. She identified three roles similar to those described by Leithwood. Thomas describes her three roles as the Director, the Administrator, and the Facilitator. Directors are principals who take an active interest in all aspects of curriculum, teaching, budgeting, and scheduling. Teachers contribute to decisions made, but ultimately the principal retains the final decision-making authority. Administrators tend to identify with district management rather than with their own facilities and leave teachers with a great deal of autonomy within their classrooms. Decision making is in the areas affecting the school as a whole. On the other hand, Facilitators perceive their role to be one of support and assistance and see themselves as colleagues of the faculties. Teachers at

these schools were actively involved in the decision-making process. The association between effective schools and principals who encourage teacher participation in school goal setting and curricular decisions is widely supported by research: Rutter, et al., 1979; Little, 1981; Stallings, 1981; Edmonds, 1981; Hall, Rutherford, Griffin, 1982. Though Thomas's definition of director is more comprehensive than Leithwood's, it is interesting to note that in her study as well, more than half of her samples fell into the administrator role, the role she found to have the least implementation of innovation.

Several studies in the 1980s examine the principal-as-person in leadership styles and capacity for personal interactions. The first of these studies was by Blumberg and Greenfield (1980). Their analysis led them to conclude that not everyone can assume the role of leading an organization in the direction of making itself better than it is. The character of the person involved is important. They listed needed characteristics of effective leaders as the following:

(1) A propensity to set clear goals and to have these goals serve as a continuous source of motivation

(2) A high degree of self-confidence and openness to others

(3) A tolerance for ambiquity

(4) A tendency to test the limits of interpersonal and organizational systems

(5) A sensitivity to the dynamics of power

(6) An analytic perspective

(7) The ability to be in charge of their jobs (De Bevoise, 1984, p. 15-16)

This list, unfortunately, neither easily lends itself to being translated into programs of professional development nor easily lends itself to being used to hire new principals.

Blumberg and Greenfield's study also described principals with eight different labels: (1) the problem-solver, (2) the value-based juggler, (3) the authentic helper, (4) the broker, (5) the humanist, (6) the catalyst, (7) the rationalist, and (8) the politician. These eight principals, all very effective in their schools though different in their approach, shared common basic elements--vision, initiative, and resources. These principals were committed to an educational vision, had the propensity to assume the initiative, take a proactive stand, and most importantly, did not allow themselves to become consumed by second order priorities.

The Florida State Department of Education commissioned a study to identify the competencies that characterize outstanding elementary and secondary principals. The findings of this study complemented those of Blumberg and Greenfield and added several competencies beyond the basic seven. Their list included a clear sense of mission and control, an ability to test the limits in providing needed resources, the possession of the art of persuasion, a commitment to high standards, the use of a participatory style, and as identified by Blumberg and Greenfield, a discontent in maintaining the status quo. (De Bevoise, 1984)

Leithwood and Montgomery's (1982) studies classified principals into two kinds: effective and typical. They found that effective principals were proactive, particularly in regard to instruction and the welfare of students. The typical principal, however, tended to be primarily responsive. Typical principals responded more to district demands and the demands from other sources of problems that are encountered daily.

Based on their own research, field experiences, and the literature, the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education (RDCTE), University of Texas at Austin, has developed descriptions of three contrasting change

facilitator styles that are composite, multidimensional, stereotypical descriptions of how some principals provide leadership. They state that one of the primary objectives of their studies is to identify the discrete behaviors and combinations of behaviors that appear to be related to successful implementation of improvement efforts. Their studies focus on (1) principals' styles as they facilitate school improvement efforts, not their general leadership styles; (2) principal-teacher interactions (Hord and Hall, 1982, Stiegelbauer and Goldstein, 1982); and (3) content (Hall and Griffen, 1982):

Responders place heavy emphasis on allowing teachers and others the opportunity to take the lead. They believe their primary role is to maintain a smooth running school by focusing on traditional administrative tasks, keeping teachers content and treating students well. Teachers are viewed as strong professionals who are able to carry out their instructional role with little guidance. Responders emphasize the personal side of their relationships with teachers and others. Before they make decisions they often give everyone an opportunity to have input so as to weigh their feelings or to allow others to make the decision. A related characteristic is the tendency toward making decisions in terms of immediate circumstances rather than in terms of longer range instructional or school goals. This seems to be due in part to their desire to please others and in part to their limited vision of how their school and staff should change in the future.

Managers represent a broader range of behaviors. They demonstrate both responsive behaviors in answer to situations or people and they also initiate actions in support of the change effort. The variations in their behavior seem to be linked to their rapport with teachers and central office staff as well as how well they understand and buy into a particular change effort. Managers work without fanfare to provide basic support to facilitate teachers' use of the innovation. They keep teachers informed about decisions and are sensitive to teachers' needs. They will defend their teachers from what are perceived as excessive demands. When they learn that the central office wants something to happen in their school, they become very much involved with their teachers in making it happen. Yet, they do not typically initiate attempts to move beyond the basics of what is imposed.

Initiators have clear, decisive long-range policies and goals that transcend but include implementation of the current innovation. They tend to have very strong beliefs about what good schools and teaching should be like and work intensely to attain this vision. Decisions are made in relation to their goals for the school and what they believe to be best for students, which is based on current knowledge of classroom practice. Initiators have strong expectations for students, teachers and themselves.

They convey and monitor these expectations through frequent contacts with teachers and clear explication of how the school is to operate and how teachers are to teach. When they feel it is in the best interest of their school, particularly the students, Initiators will seek changes in district programs or policies or they will reinterpret them to suit the needs of the school. Initiators will be adamant but not unkind; they solicit input from staff, and then decisions are made about the goal of the school even if some are ruffled by their directness and high expectations. (Hall and Rutherford, 1983)

In short--Initiators make it happen; Managers help it happen; and Responders let it happen. (Hall and Rutherford, 1983)

No principal or other change facilitator fully fits into any one style. Nor can these three Change Facilitator (CF) styles, Hall and Rutherford caution, represent the entire universe of possibilities. They are, instead, three distinguishable styles that can more easily be described and found in schools in which innovations have been implemented. (In the remainder of the paper the University of Texas descriptors will be used when discussing facilitator styles/behavior, for their model seems to synthesize findings of the other researchers.)

Determining Effective Change Facilitator Style

Which style of change facilitator is most desirable? That will depend on the criteria used for effectiveness. If implementation success is the criterion, Initiator style is most effective. Although implementation was accomplished by all three CF styles, there was more quality and quantity in schools with Initiator style principals than in schools with Managers and Responders. If, however, the teachers' positive perceptions of their working climate is considered the most important criterion, then Manager style was more effective. It was found that Managers protect their teachers and strive to keep things running smoothly. Their teachers then are more satisfied. Though Initiators listen to their teachers, they have high expectation and push. This constant pressure is not always appreciated by

the teachers. Responders are most concerned about their teachers' feelings and perceptions, but they tend to respond to them one at a time without coordinated or consistent communication and priorities. Teachers often feel more job ambiguity and less control.

The most desirable style to improve student achievement is not known. All that is known about the "most desirable" style is that for each gain within a style, there is a risk of loss somewhere.

Perhaps implementation game plans need to be adapted to different schools depending on the style of change facilitator of the principal and assistant principal. Implementation would proceed rather routinely if the principal's style were Manager, once the principal understood what was to be done. In a Responder's school, central office staff would probably need to spend more time encouraging and working with the teachers. While a certain amount of push might be necessary to get the innovation on the Initiator's priority list, all the central office staff would have to do after that is to "get out of the way."

The obvious link that research has shown between effective principals and change suggest that school systems and communities need to support principals who are "boat-rockers," those who are not satisfied to keep a low profile or to maintain the status quo. Furthermore, building level autonomy must exist in order to provide an opportunity for these principals to use their skills and to develop strategies. (Manasse, 1984)

SECOND CHANGE FACILITATORS

In contrast to the publicized position of many national policy makers and theoreticians is Hord, Hall, and Stiegelbauer's finding (1983) that when facilitating school improvement, principals do not do it alone. Their research revealed that the leadership in a school improvement effort is a shared one. In each study, there was a Second Change Facilitator (Second CF), a person who was as active as the principal and in some cases even more active.

They found that the Second CF may be an assistant principal, a teacher assigned the added responsibilities for facilitating the school improvement effort, or someone whose total role and responsibility are described as that of a change facilitator. These Second CFs are either school based or assigned to an area level or district. Research also revealed that what they did was more important than who they were.

How do Second CFs compare to principals? Hord, et al., (1983) found in their research the following:

> The number of Second CF interventions (541) was almost equal to that of the principals (583).
>
> Principals did more simple interventions (briefer and less involved substantively) than the Second CFs whose interventions were usually longer and contained multiactions.
>
> The distribution of the Second CF intervention targets was parallel to those of their principals.
>
> In general, the Second CFs did fewer support and organization interventions, more formal training, more consultation and reinforcement, equal monitoring and evaluation, less external communication, and half as much responding to concerns.
>
> The medium of delivering interventions was similar, but the Second CF was more interactive and less one-way.

Second CF interventions occurred half as much in the office and nearly three times the number that took place in the classroom.

When the Second CF was an assistant principal, more interventions did not occur. Instead, the job of facilitating implementation was divided between the principal and the assistant principal.

It also appeared that, of the three facilitating styles of principals, the most intensive and complementary intervention occurred between principal and Second CF when the principal used the Initiator style. The Second CF did less when the principal used the Manager style. In the Responder-led school, however, it appears that the Second CF was in the position of having to pick up what the principal didn't do and was constantly prodding the principal to carry out his end of the work. The location of the Second CF would appear to be critical, then, when the principal uses Responder style.

Gersten and Carnine (1981) identified six administrative and supervisory functions essential to instructional improvement: (1) implementing programs of known effectiveness or being active in curriculum improvement efforts, (2) monitoring student performance, (3) monitoring teacher performance, (4) providing concrete technical assistance to teachers, (5) demonstrating visible commitment to programs, and (6) providing emotional support and incentives for teachers. These functions, however, need not be carried out by the principal. Gersten and Carnine argue that most principals are either not trained or have too many other demands on their time.

These data supported an earlier hypothesis of Hall, Rutherford, and Griffin (1982), who see an array of dimensions that are essential for having successful school change: some established by the principal and some delivered by other actors and contextual factors. The perceived degree of

success would then depend on having a full set of dimensions, but not all of them necessarily having to be done by the principal.

For example, one of the essential dimensions is "push." In order for implementation to occur, the innovation must be pushed. If the principal uses Initiator CF Style, the push comes from him. A principal who uses Responder CF Style is not likely to provide the needed push. It could come from an assistant principal or some other actor (e.g., community pressure). "Sanctioning," or permitting the use of the innovation, on the other hand, is another essential dimension. But this dimension must be done by the principal if rewards and resources are to be forthcoming to support implementation. (Figure 4)

Figure 4

A Possible Framework for Identifying Critical Principal Tasks in Facilitating School Change

	Action/Task	Potential Effects
Principal must do	Sanctioning	Permits activity to occur
Principal can or someone else must do	Push	Makes priorities or clear
Not the principal's job	Day-to-day innovation, specific technical assistance	Teachers need this assistance, but principals do not have the time and may not have the technical skills.

(p. 16)

"In the Responder-led schools, the principal is at the threshold of this needed minimum [critical subset of tasks]. In the Manager-led schools, the principal, with the best of intentions, goes too far beyond the minimum and may even block out intervention possibilities of the Second CF. And in the Initiator-led schools there is a balance between the interventions of the principals and the Second CFs." (Hord et al., p. 155) Because balance is needed it appears then practitioners and policy makers need to give more careful thought to the role of the Second CFs and their relationship with their principal.

The location of the Second CF also seems to be related to the principal Facilitator style. Principals who used the Initiator or Manager CF style had the Second CF located within their schools. Schools with principals using the Responder style had the Second CF located in the central offices. Hord, et al. concluded that Initiators and Managers organize and use their own staffs and resources to facilitate implementation. The Responder, however, waits for someone from the central office to initiate action and to keep the implementation effort alive.

Findings from Hord's study suggest perhaps that principals and policy makers need to consider factors related to the identification, training, placement, and role of the Second CF when they are planning school improvements. Their study suggested the Second CF role is one that emerges out of necessity and carries with it little recognition and no training. Hord et al. went on to hypothesize that effectiveness of facilitation and success in implementation of school improvement efforts could be greatly enhanced if Second CFs were identified, trained, and had clarified for them their mutually supportive roles.

The provision of instructional leadership can be viewed as a responsiblity that is shared. Principals may initiate, encourage, and facilitate the accomplishment of instructional improvement according to their own abilities, styles, and contextual circumstances, but they will still need a lot of help from others if improvement is to become the norm. Hord, et al., (1983) adds that he and his colleagues speculate that the more broadly the facilitation of change is distributed, the greater the prospect for continuation of a particular set of practices exists.

INSERVICE TRAINING FOR PRINCIPALS AS CHANGE FACILITATORS

> "Building principals are key figures in the innovation process. Where they are both aware of and sympathetic to an innovation, it tends to prosper. Where they are ignorant of its existence, or apathetic if not hostile, it tends to remain outside the blood stream of the school..." (Demeter, 1951)

While awareness and sympathy are critical so, too, are the roles and responsibilities of change facilitators. Lazarsfed (1963) has stated that all administrators are faced with four major tasks: (1) the administrator must fulfill the goals of the organization, (2) the administrator must make use of other people in fulfilling these goals and make use of them in such a way as to release their initiative and creativity, (3) the administrator must face the humanitarian aspects of his job, and (4) the administrator must try to build into his organization provisions for innovations, change, and development.

Rationale

Today's rapidly changing circumstances and pressures make task number four particularly vital. Technological advances, the knowledge explosion, social conflicts, federal legislation, school board responses to volatile issues, and dissipation of citizens' financial commitment to public schools

are examples of the numerous and diverse forces that influence the school administrator's functions and skills (Robinson, 1977). These new demands require new dimensions of a principal's time-honored skills, and these new situations also require new strategies. The role of the principal is changing.

In the past, the principal has been viewed as an administrator whose major responsibility was to accomplish goals through the use of established means; the best administrator traditionally was one who could follow established policy and procedures and could make others do likewise. Today's vision of the role of a leader, however, is for the administrator to establish goals or to formulate with the staff new goals for the school. It is this latter role that currently influences our view of the principal. The setting for effecting significant educational change is the single school with its principal as leader.

Administrative structure may be reorganized, new personnel hired, increases in budgets for materials and supplies made--but the effect of all these changes will be diluted by principals whose past experiences and training do not prepare them for their roles as the principal facilitators of change. Because it is principals who set the tone and the methodology of change, it is essential that they understand both the nature and the process of change. Rutherford (1981) compares the process to that used in the planning strategies for a football game:

> "In advance of the actual game, the coach and team establish in careful detail which offensive plays they intend to call under certain circumstances and which defensive alignments they will use. Beyond that, they try to anticipate all possible situations in which the team may find itself and to plan out in advance what actions they will take for each of those many possibilities. All of these plans are written or diagrammed out and organized in a manner that makes them immediately accessible to the coaches at any time during the game." (p. 16)

If we as educators had developed game plans for the implementation of new programs or practices within our schools with the same level of sophistication and to the same degree of detail as professional football teams plan for their Saturday night's game, the Rand Corporation Study would likely not have read that "the net return to the federal investment was the adoption of many innovations, the successful implementation of few, and the long-run continuation of still fewer..." (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978). Changes in schools require more than the selection and introduction of "better" programs. Effective changes require principals who are able to adopt the school's response to the change.

"Analysis of innovative educational projects revealed that the two common inadequacies of administrators involve their inability to anticipate unintended outcomes and their ineffectiveness in dealing with unanticipated consequences. Important educational innovations will occur only when strong leadership of both the formal and informal types is displayed." (CROFT NIE, 1977, p.1-2)

Change occurs in one of three ways: by evolution, by revolution, or by systematic development. Those engaged in the business of creating educational change prefer that changes in their schools occur via the latter method. The development of skills, techniques, and strategies to effect change should become an essential part of any training program for school administrators. Unfortunately, the "how-tos" of effecting change are an area often ignored in the training programs of administrators. The norm is for principals to be told that they are responsible for improving student achievement--usually resulting in increased scores on standardized achievement tests--but are not given the resources and specialized training needed to accomplish the task. "There seems to be an unstated assumption

that principals already have the knowledge and skills needed to accomplish the desired improvements" (Hall, Rutherford, 1983, p. 53-54). This unfortunately is not always true. Many principals are not prepared to serve effectively as facilitators of improvement.

The most frequent source used by principals to find ideas that initiate planned changes are other principals and teachers (23%). Professional reading (19%) and local workshops (16%) follow as sources of ideas. In rating preparation for the position of principal, principals named on the job experience (85%) as the most beneficial followed by graduate education (36%) and inservice programs (24%). Because inservice programs for principals are becoming more prevalent, attention must be given to what constitutes useful inservice training (Fullan, 1980).

Educators contend that a person cannot become a principal without first having taught. The experience, it is believed, provides one with an appreciation for and an understanding of the goals and problems of teachers and students. Yet, being a teacher for a number of years may be antithetical to being an instructional leader or an educational change facilitator (Sarason, 1971). Years of classroom experiences with children do not necessarily mean that those experiences prepare one for working with adults. Secondly, teachers are autonomous in their classrooms and often have few opportunities to interact with one another. Thus, they do not feel themselves to be part of a working or planning group. This isolation is even more emphasized once a teacher becomes an administrator. Then, too, a teacher often has unrealistic pictures of the complexity of the role of the principal. It is impossible for teachers to observe principals in the wide variety of relationships and roles in which principals engage. A teacher's "picture" of the principal is primarily determined by the personal

teacher-principal relationship. This undoubtedly affects how a teacher views school and the principal's role. And finally, one of the major criteria for choosing principals is that they were good teachers--"good" referring not only to the quality of teaching but also to an implicit acceptance of the way things are.

Teaching experiences do not prepare individuals for the role of principal. Newly appointed principals, fresh from the classroom, come to their new position with a faulty and incomplete picture of their roles, of the system, and what it will or will not permit. Their knowledge that what they want to do will probably be encountered with frustrating obstacles serves to justify their staying near the lower limits of their roles and taking a more passive rather than active role in shaping education.

Licata (1975) lists other drawbacks principals may encounter:

(1) The principal's position with the school's social system, which often inhibits his ability to see the system as a whole,

(2) the expectation that the principal can provide expertise necessary for innovations in numerous specialized areas,

(3) the public schools' unrealistic expectation that principals always should be successful, and

(4) the dual relationships with the members of his staff (e.g., on one hand he is associated with the rewarding and punishing required of administration, and on the other hand he is viewed as a viable helping consultant).

Climate for Change

Licata states that despite the many drawbacks facing principals, principals can be instrumental in helping to develop a social-emotional climate which facilitates innovation. Everyone in the school's social

system is a potential resource to help bring about change. When the principal's behavior is other-supportive (behaviors whose dominant intent is to encourage and to praise), he is demonstrating his belief in the potential of others and is therefore providing a climate which invites their participation. Other-supportive leadership, according to Licata, is a deliberate behavior on the part of the leader aimed to help the group toward its identified goals. The behavioral pattern chosen will have a strong tendency to be adopted by the followership at every level of the organization. Principals need to organize a school so that teachers may gain esteem and self-actualization.

If 80 percent of our resources in education are invested in human beings, then the principal who invests his efforts in human activities such as self-understanding, selling an open climate, building communication structures, managing conflict, clarifying decision-making roles, paying attention to each individual's capacity for change, and implementing problem-solving procedures will be a successful leader (Tye, 1972).

Observations made in the League of Cooperating Schools (18 elementary schools in Southern California) and the review of research, theory, and literature in the fields of leadership behavior, the change process, group dynamics and administrative theory led to the description of nine conditions that Tye believes can serve as guidelines for preservice or inservice training programs to promote principals as change facilitators. The nine conditions are as follows: (1) the principal gains self-understanding through an assessment of his strengths and weaknesses, through a knowledge of how others see him, and through a knowledge of his own disposition to change; (2) the principal is aware of and able to deal with the many and often conflicting role expectations placed upon him by different groups; (3)

the principal is aware of the components of effective leadership; (4) the principal has an understanding of the change process; (5) the principal looks outside for ideas rather than always from within his own system; (6) the principal is efficient in group dynamics; (7) the principal, with his teachers, can adequately identify problems and define goals to solve those problems; (8) the principal has background in administrative theory; and (9) the principal can research literature (Tye, 1970).

In addition, the principal must also be able to then create within his school certain conditions: (1) the principal change facilitator must be a role model and demonstrate those traits and behaviors he wishes his staff to have; (2) the principal change facilitator must not forget that, like students, teachers have vastly different strengths and weaknesses and that these unique talents and goals of his staff members need to be taken into account when establishing an atmosphere of cooperation; (3) the principal as a change facilitator has threefold responsibilities related to decision making--serving as a monitor for instructional decisions made by teachers, providing a setting where decision making can be carried out, and serving as a transactional agent between and among the different levels and groups of decision makers; (4) the principal change facilitator must recognize that disequilibrium is a necessary condition for change; (5) the principal change facilitator needs to understand that people change more easily when the change helps them to solve problems which are real to them; (6) the principal change facilitator needs to allow his staff the freedom to be involved in the process and decisions that influence their work; (7) the principal change facilitator promotes open, frank, and frequent communication by behaving in a firm and friendly manner, by creating a cooperative atmosphere, and by using informal channels of communications;

(8) the principal as change facilitator utilizes appropriate forms of influence to create a climate for change; (9) the principal change facilitator assesses reasons for resistance on an individual basis and deals with such resistance in a variety of ways--each an appropriate intervention; (10) a principal change facilitator should always analyze the situation to see where burdens can be lightened; (11) the principal change facilitator must be able to know how much change can be managed at any one time while still maintaining quality (Tye, 1970).

Change Process

Paul A. Leary stresses that specialized training for change facilitators should include the following principles of how to effect change: the variables involved in the process of change; instruction in the conducting, reading, and interpreting of appropriate research in order to "shorten the gap between research and the practitioner" (p. 11); communication techniques needed to communicate the knowledge derived, extracted, and interpreted; and skills for evaluating change efforts that may be used as a guide for planned future activities.

Researchers and policy makers recently have come to realize that the ultimate unit for examining the effectiveness and the adoption of curricular changes in school is the individual teacher. Inservice training for principals is needed to train them in ways to enhance their abilities to design and deliver appropriate interventions as a means for supporting teachers as the teachers attempt to implement an innovation. Identifying and describing the kinds of interventions that influence teachers' use of innovations has been the major emphasis of Hord and Hall's Research on Improvement Process (RIP) Program of the Texas Research and Development Center (1982). Rutherford (1981) describes the intervention frameworks used

by Hord and Hall for collecting, describing, and analyzing principals' behaviors as they intervened during implementations of innovations (Figure 5). The identification of the factors that influence or determine a principal's effectiveness is needed in order to incorporate them into programs for training effective principals.

The functions of Consultation and Reinforcement could be called "follow-up." Hord, Huling, Stiegelbauer (1983) stated that "Implementation is won in the follow-up trenches of the one-to-one interactions with teachers about their problems and concerns with changing their practice" (p. 46). These actions are powerful interventions, for they respond to a teacher's need for information, encouragement, and assistance for understanding how to make the innovation work for them and for their students.

Function 4, Monitoring and Evaluation, is needed to act as a prior step to Consultation. "Not to monitor is not to know; not to know dilutes what to do ...collecting information about individual teachers as they work to implement change makes it possible to select or design an appropriate intervention to help teachers improve their practice" (Hord, Huling, Stiegelbauer, p. 46).

"Constructing a game plan of interventions could help a principal to specify in advance the actions to be made, thus utilizing the levels of intervention as a planning tool" (Hord and Hall, 1982). If trained, principals would be able to enhance their planning and intervening skills (Hord, Thurber and Hall, 1981). They could learn to use the anatomic framework for self analysis of their own interventions: identifying gaps in their attentions to certain functions or providing them with more options for their action design.

Figure 5

FUNCTIONS

1. DEVELOPING SUPPORTIVE ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

   A. Policy/Decision Making
   B. Planning
   C. Managing (i.e., Scheduling)
   D. Staffing or Restructuring Roles
   E. Seeking or Providing Materials, Information, Space, Other Resources (i.e., Funds)
   F. Other (Specify)

2. TRAINING

   A. Teaching New Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes
   B. Reviewing
   C. Clarifying
   D. Other (Specify)

3. PROVIDING CONSULTING AND REINFORCEMENT

   A. Promoting/Encouraging Innovation Use
   B. Reinforcing/Supporting Innovation Use
   C. Consulting--Problem Solving
   D. Information Sharing (Internal Communication, i.e., Newsletters)
   E. Other (Specify)

4. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

   A. Information Gathering (Data Collecting, Pulsing, Probing)
   B. Data Analysis Processing
   C. Reporting
   D. Other

5. EXTERNAL COMMUNICATION

   A. Informing Outsiders
   B. Other (Specify)

6. DISSEMINATING

   A. Gaining Support of Outsiders
   B. Encouraging/Promoting Use of Innovation by Outsiders
   C. Other (Specify)

7. IMPEDING

   A. Discouraging Use
   B. Interrupting Use
   C. Other (Specify)

8. BLANK (Specify)

Change Facilitator Concerns

Increased attention on the classroom level variable has led to the rethinking of the roles and needs of others seen as critical for successful school change--the school principal. Research emphasis has shifted to analyzing how the building principal affects what happens to teachers. Professionals at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas at Austin, conclude in their research that school leaders do have concerns about facilitating changes and that these concerns shift from time to time (Figure 6). Decision makers, therefore, need to be cognitive of this and to provide assistance through inservice training which is designed to improve the principal's facilitating skills. Change is a process for principals as well as teachers--it is not an event.

Concerns theory has significant implications for staff development activities for principal change facilitators. Two premises have been made: (1) good skills, developed through good training, are necessary for good facilitators and (2) effective training must consider the individual concerns of the facilitators. The concerns that principals as change facilitators have should determine the kinds of assistance that will be most helpful to them (Rutherford, Hall, Newlove, 1982).

Staff development programs that deal with all principals as if they were one undifferentiated group are not attending to the specific differences of the individuals who constitute the group. Staff development programs too often do not reflect natural distribution. This appears to be essentially important when considering the principal's role in change facilitation. Some form of individualization is desperately needed (Hull, et al., 1982). Staff development is important to improving the performance of change facilitators just as staff development is important to improving

teacher performance. The two are, in fact, closely related. The change facilitator's performance influences teacher performance as teachers attempt to use the innovation (Rutherford, Hall, Newlove, 1982). Developing better principals "may even be seen as an indirect approach to the development of teachers because good principals hire, train, and develop good teachers." (Crughan and Lake, 1984, p.2)

Figure 6

Definitions:

Change Facilitator Stages of Concern

6 REFOCUSING: Ideas about alternatives to the innovation are a focus. Thoughts and opinions oriented toward increasing benefits to clients are based on substantive questions about the maximum effectiveness of the present innovative thrust. Thought is being given to alternative forms or possible replacement of the innovation.

5 COLLABORATION: Coordinating with other change facilitators and/or administrators to increase one's capacity in facilitating use of the innovation is the focus. Increased coordination and communication for increased effectiveness of the innovation are the focus. Issues related to involving other leaders in support of and facilitating use of the innovation for increased impact are indicated.

4 CONSEQUENCE: Attention is on improving one's own style of change facilitation and increasing positive innovation effects. Increasing the effectiveness of users and analyzing the effects on clients are the foci. Expanding his/her facility and style for facilitating change is also the focus.

3 MANAGEMENT: The time, logistics, available resources and energy involved in facilitating others in use of the innovation are the focus. Attention is on the "how to do its" of change facilitation and decreasing the difficulty of managing the change process.

2 PERSONAL: Uncertainty about one's ability and role in facilitating use of the innovation is indicated. Doubts about one's adequacy in being able to be an effective change facilitator and questions about institutional support and rewards for doing the job are included. Lack of confidence in oneself or in the support to be received from superiors, nonusers and users are a part of this stage.

1 INFORMATIONAL: There is interest in learning more about the innovation. The concern is not self-oriented or necessarily change facilitation oriented. The focus is on the need/desire to know more about the innovation in general, its characteristics, effects and requirements for use.

0 AWARENESS: Change facilitation in relation to the innovation is not an area of intense concern. The person's attention is focused elsewhere.

(Rutherford, Hall, and Newlove, 1982, p. 6)

Facilitator Style

Hall, et al., do not support the situational leadership training models of Blake and Mouton or Hersey and Blanchard both of whom theorize that leaders need to change their style depending on the particular conditions at a given time. In fact, Hall, et al., have found little evidence to suggest that either Responders or Initiators are adept at changing their facilitator styles. Managers appear to be able to adapt their styles as they relate to implementation of particular innovations. (For example, they tend to start out in a Responder mode, but with support and consultation they can shift to acting more like an Initiator.) "If leaders are adaptable, it does not appear that these shifts are easily accomplished and sustained" (Hall and Rutherford, 1983, p. 20). One's style is too closely tied to personality and history to be easily changed. Training, concerns-based coaching, and support can aid in improvement. Training programs to assist principals and Second CF in becoming more sensitive to the importance of identified behaviors and in using them with greater care is needed and certainly possible. Decrees, mandates, and two-day workshops, on the other hand, will net little, if any, major changes in style.

Hiring procedures is another area to consider. Interviewing procedures could be helpful in identifying candidates who appear already to have mastered the desired behaviors. In selecting managers, industry is already exploring the indicators that identify individuals who aspire to become more effective in the change facilitator role, and industry is also developing procedures for identifying those who have the most potential as change facilitators.

IMPLICATIONS

Change is a planned, systematic, controlled effort which affects the various aspects of an organization including its tasks, structure, technology, and participants. Change is an individual process, a social process involving the interactions of people, and a systems process in which a change in one subsystem may affect one or more other subsystems.

Introducing change requires shifting people, resources, relations, and schedules. This means that if principals want results they have to shape them. They need to combine muscle, tenderness, and tutoring or as Dale Mann (1983) says, "Leading schools takes both strokes and pokes. Adding, balancing, alternating the two will enhance the purposes of public schooling" (p. 22). If principals are viewed as the instructional leaders and the gatekeepers to effective change, what implications for education does their role as change facilitators have?

School Improvement Efforts

School improvement is not likely to happen quickly. Data reveal that there is a "high price to pay for improvement and the price tag is marked Intervention Time" (Hord, et al, 1983 p. 42). The integration of new ideas and the incorporation of these ideas into the curriculum are not accomplished in one year. Implementation takes from three to five years. With this in mind, principals who have been trained as change facilitators will know that they need to allow for adequate time to implement new programs and will understand that the introduction of a second new program will likely be a self-defeating strategy if their teachers are still involved in the implementation of program number one.

Student Achievement

Desirable characteristics of change facilitator styles have not yet been convincingly correlated with student achievement. More research is needed to clarify how different styles and personalities interact and whether these have a measured effect on student achievement. Research must focus on which styles/characteristics contribute and whether these same styles/characteristics can be replicated in other contexts.

Program Evaluation

Formative. Implementative decisions need more reliable data than a subjective impression of how things are going. Formative evaluation can be enhanced by a valid measure, such as the Levels of Use assessment, which provides the change facilitator with valuable data as he makes decisions regarding budgets, personnel, and staff development.

The concepts of CBAM, SoC and LoU, have several implications for principals involved in implementing change. If principals as change facilitators know how people generally move sequentially through the various Levels of Use as their concerns are satisfied, the principals' efforts to implement change can be planned to support this movement from one level to the next. This knowledge of where each teacher is in relationship to implementation provides valuable input not only for staff development but also for policy decisions. For example, research indicates that it takes at least a year for the use of an innovation to reach a Mechanical level. Change efforts then need to be planned in long-range terms. Innovations introduced today cannot be expected to be fully implemented by tomorrow--or even by the end of the first year.

During the first year(s) of an innovation, principals who are change facilitators realize they need to provide their staffs with the appropriate

information and support that each staff member needs. Differentiated staff development must be built into the long-range plan for change. A teacher at the Preparation level will need supplies, equipment, and input as to what the innovation looks like. A teacher at the Mechanical level, however, will need managerial support to help overcome organizational and managerial problems.

The ability to monitor the change by assessing the LoU throughout the implementation effort can provide principals with relevant data for the continual planning required. According to Louck (1978), "...planning for change cannot be completed before the change is introduced. Rather, it must be continuous, and undergo revision as individuals change and put the innovation into practice" (p.10).

Summative. Louck (1978) cautions us concerning the timing of Summative evaluation. Her research supports other findings done by the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education in Austin that large numbers of innovation users reach and remain in the Mechanical Level of use throughout the first year of implementation. Principals who are trained in the change process and are evaluating an innovation or who are having an outside agency evaluate the innovation are aware of its varying Levels of Use and its implications. According to Louck, a "summative evaluation based on outcomes measured in the first year of use could find the innovation unsuccessful and may doom it before it is given a chance to produce the promised outcomes" (p.11). If the majority of the teachers are still at the Mechanical level or below, implementation has not occurred, and it would not be appropriate to measure outcomes before the change process was completed.

For example, an evaluative design calling for the comparison of student outcomes between a group of teachers who are not using the innovation and a

group of teachers who are using the innovation may indicate no significant differences. If, however, the evaluators were to examine the Levels of Use of the users they may find that the innovation there, too, is not being used.

Personnel Evaluation

Principals who have been trained as change facilitators will be able to evaluate not only the implementation of an innovation but also the implementors. The purpose of personnel evaluations will be expanded. Principals will be able to use the evaluation to help them make better instructional decisions. Unlike so many staff evaluations, the principals will know specifically the evidence of the skill they are evaluating. If the critical elements are absent, teachers will then receive from the principal appropriate interventions rather than a vague "unsatisfactory" or "needs improvement." Teachers will benefit. They will have more support to help them improve their skills as professional educators.

Second Change Facilitators

Principals who are aware of the role of the second change facilitator and who are also trained in the strategies of capitalizing on this available resource by making appropriate use of it could play a vital part in the staff development and professional growth of teachers. Assuming the role of a second change facilitator provides excellent training and experience for future administrators and could be used by local school systems to identify those teachers who are interested in and have the potential for becoming effective agents of educational change. These teachers then could be promoted to the positions of principals or central office supervisors.

Principals who are change facilitators would not only assist in the actual training of second change facilitators by administrating appropriate

interventions or guidance but also would serve as models for them. Because of the potential benefits, an effort should be made to train principals to be change facilitators and to be trainers of other potential change facilitators.

Inservice Education

Hanson (1980) states that change does not occur in a social vacuum but instead in a shared environment. Administrative indifference or nonacceptance can crush a new idea. It is part of the principal's role as a change facilitator to spread the contagion of ideas and to strengthen group cohesiveness and interpersonal communications needed for program change. Hanson goes on to say that the hallmark of a true profession is one in which the most recent and vital information is disseminated and used by its members. Principals as change facilitators are responsible for effective inservice education of staffs--inservice education that not only will assist teachers in identifying appropriate behaviors to meet their needs and goals as educators but also will assist them in converting these behaviors into classroom activities (theory to practice). The principal as a change facilitator recognizes that inservice training is part of the change process and, therefore, views it as an investment where the dividends of improved teaching and student outcomes can be anticipated. The principal as change facilitator realizes that while specialization often can contribute to the success of an organization it can also contribute to the disunity of an organization. Over-specialization of teachers may seriously hamper the development of a broad comprehensive educational program. Part of the inservice education should be designed to develop for teachers this wider view of the total educational program.

Before the principal should be expected to meet teachers' needs, his own needs must first be met. Principals need inservice education that assists them in understanding their roles and responsibilities in the change process. They need, too, to be able to analyze their strengths and weaknesses as facilitators of change and how these affect their interactions with staff. Once their needs and concerns have been met, they will be able to deal more effectively with the change process and with teacher needs and concerns.

Placement of Personnel

The placement of personnel can be viewed as a linking of the human resources within a system, the effective use of people to fulfill the goals of the organization. School systems often need to shift or replace principals who have either left the system or who have been promoted to another position within the system. What are the implications of having a person with one change facilitator style being followed by someone with a different change facilitator style? What effect does this have on the staff? The implementation effort? The second change facilitator? How will the second change facilitator be identified as someone who has the personality and style that will best complement the principal's, enabling them to work more efficiently together?

APPLYING THE FINDINGS REGARDING THE PRINCIPAL AS CHANGE AGENT: ONE MODEL

SPUR, Louisiana's highly successful Special Plan Upgrading Reading, is one example of how the findings regarding the principal as change agent may be applied to build schools of excellence. In this six-year school improvement effort, the principal's role as change agent has been facilitated in two ways:

(1) providing a process and structure for change, and

(2) providing the services of an outside change agent to model and assist the principal in implementing change.

Providing a Process and Structure for Change

As previously discussed, effective principals are proactive with a sense of purpose and direction provided by a well-developed, clearly stated set of goals. They have a vision of their schools, their role within these schools, and the change process (Manasse, 1984); they encourage teachers to participate in setting goals and making decisions regarding curriculum (Rutter, et al., 1979; Little, 1981; Stallings, 1981; Edmonds, 1981); and they have the interpersonal skills to secure commitment to common values.

In order to provide principals with a vision to guide their school improvement effort, training was given on the components/characteristics of an exemplary instructional program and visits were made to schools modeling these characteristics. The principals' roles as instructional leaders were clarified, and specific behaviors were identified and reinforced via dialogue with fellow principals.

Once the principals had a vision of what their schools should be, they were trained and assisted in implementing a process of collaborative

planning and problem solving. Simply stated, the process involves assessing needs and developing a plan to meet those needs. The process is cyclical and involves (1) determining needs, (2) establishing goals, (3) specifying objectives, (4) setting priorities, (5) selecting activities, (6) establishing timelines, and (7) implementing, evaluating, adjusting, and maintaining the plan.

Structure and support for the principal and the program improvement process are provided at the school level by the principal's designation of a representative group (Task Force or Building Level Team) who engage in the planning process to develop a written action plan and share the responsibility for its implementation. The group seeks input: guidance and involvement from all individuals to be affected by the change. Through collaborative planning comes ownership and commitment to common goals. The process builds a climate conducive to change as discussed by Licata (1975) and Tye (1972) and allows the principal to capitalize on the unique talents of staff members. Teachers gain esteem and self-actualization and at the same time complement the principal's style of leadership.

Providing an Outside Change Agent

Based on research from the Rand Study (McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978) that staff training activities must be accompanied by training support activities if permanent change is to occur, a critical component of SPUR has been the provision of an outside change agent (Technical Assistant) to provide on-site technical assistance and support to principals and their staffs in the initiation, implementation, and continuation of desired changes. Their function is consistent with the findings of Hord, Hall, and Stiegelbauer (1983) on the role of Second Change Facilitators. They facilitate, coordinate, support, assess, and provide guidance in identifying strengths, needs, alternatives, potential problems/solutions, and, in general, help to

create an atmosphere in which there can be collaborative planning to build schools of excellence (SPUR Handbook, 1982-83).

Participating systems and schools attribute a large portion of SPUR's success to the quality of the Technical Assistants (TA's) and the services they provide. TAs are carefully selected and must have demonstrated skill in working effectively with people. In addition, TAs receive constant inservice training on the comprehensive instructional program as well as on change agentry. In regard to change agentry, technical assistants have received training on five identified variables of change: (1) the system, (2) the group, (3) the individual, (4) the change process, and (5) the change agent. By understanding these variables and their impact on the school improvement efforts, Technical Assistants can make appropriate interventions to facilitate change and reduce roadblocks. (Copies of the change agentry training modules are available from the SPUR office in the Louisiana Department of Education.)

Future Plans

Through SPUR, principals and central office staffs have been trained in the components and characteristics of comprehensive instructional programs as well as in a process and structure for change. Future plans are to provide in-depth training in the five variables of change in which the technical assistants have already been trained. A first step will be, as Tye (1972) suggests, ways to help each principal to gain self-understanding through an assessment of his or her own strengths and weaknesses and disposition to change. By analyzing his or her style of leadership in relation to those factors within the system, the group, and the individual that inhibit and promote change, the principal should become more skillful in leading a systematic change effort which capitalizes on the strengths and abilities of the total school staff.

Bibliography

Alfonso, R. J.; Firth, G.; and Neville, R. Instructional Supervision: A Major Behavior System. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1981.

Berman, P. and McLaughlin, M. W. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. III: Implementing and Systaining Innovations. Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, 1978.

Blumberg, A. and Greenfield, W. The Effective Principal. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1980.

Blumberg, Arthur, and Greenfield, William. The Effective Principal: Perspective on School Leadership. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1980.

CROFT. "Change Agentry: A Vital Skill." The Reading Report. NIE (June 1977): 1-2.

Croghan, John H. "Competencies of Effective Principals and Strategies for Implementation." Paper prepared for the Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement, North Carolina, November 1984.

De Bevoise, Wynn. "Synthesis of Research on the Principal as Instructional Leader." Educational Leadership (February 1984): 14-20.

Demeter, Lee H. "Accelerating the Local Use of Improved Educational Practices in School Systems." Cited by Kenneth A. Tye, The National Elementary Principal, February 1970, p. 42.

Fullan, Michael. "The Role of Human Agents Internal to School Districts in Knowledge Utilization." Paper prepared for Program on Research and Practice, National Institute for Studies in Education, and Far West Educational Laboratory. April 1980.

Ganz, Harold, and Hoy, Wayne K. "Patterns of Sucession of Elementary Principals and Organizational Change." Planning and Changing (Summer-Fall 1977): 185-190.

Gersten, Russell, and Cornine, Douglas. "Administrative and Supervisory Support Functions for the Implementation of Effective Educational Programs for Low Income Students." Eugene, Oregon: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, 1981.

Griffiths, Daniel E. Administrative Theory. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959.

Hall, Gene E. "Overview of the Concerns-Based Approach to Staff Development with Emphasis on the Role of the Principal." Summary of points made during presentation at the Conference on Effective Schools through Staff Development and Administrative Support, Eugene, Oregon, July, 1983.

Hall, G. E., and Griffin, T. "Analyzing Context/Climate in School Settings--Which is Which?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, 1982.

Hall, Gene E.; Hord, Shirley M.; Huling, Leslie L.; Rutherford, William L.; and Stiegelbauer, Suzanne M. "Leadership Variables Associated with Successful School Improvement." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada, April 1983.

Hall, Gene E., and Rutherford, William L. "Three Change Facilitator Styles: How Principals Affect Improvement Efforts." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada, 1983.

Hall, Gene E.; Rutherford, William L.; and Griffin, Teresa H. "Three Change Facilitator Styles: Some Indicators and a Proposed Framework." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, March, 1982.

Hall, Gene; Rutherford, William L.; Hord, Shirley M.; and Huling, Leslie L. "Effects of Three Principal Styles on School Improvement." Educational Leadership (February 1984) 22-29.

Hansen, J. Merrell, "Why Inservice? An Obligation of Schools To Provide the Best." NASSP Bulletin. (December 1980): 67-73.

Hord, Shirley M., and Goldstein, Marcia L. "What Do Principals Do to Facilitate Change: Their Interventions." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, March, 1982.

Hord, Shirley M., and Hall, Gene E. "Procedures for Quantitative Analysis of Change Facilitator Interventions." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, March 1982.

Hord, Shirley M., Hall, Gene E., and Stiegelbauer, Suzanne M. "Principals Don't Do It Alone: The Role of the Consigliere." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Montreal, Canada 1983.

Hord, Shirley M.; Huling, Leslie L.; and Stiegelbauer, Suzanne M. "An Analysis of Interventions in School Improvement Efforts." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada, 1983.

Huff, Sheila; Lake, Dale; and Schaalman, Mary Lou. Principal Differences: Excellence in School Leadership and Management. A study conducted for the Department of Education, State of Florida. Boston: McBer and Company, 1982.

Jago, A. G. "Leadership: Perspectives in Theory and Research." (Mimeographed, no date).

Lazarsfeld, Paul F. "The Social Sciences and Administration: A Rationale." Lorne Downey and Frederick Enns, eds. The Social Sciences and Educational Administration. Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1963.

Leary, Paul A. "Research Utilization: An Action Guide for the Change Agent." West Virginia University Rehabilitation Research and Training Center (Mimeograph).

Leithwood, K. A., and Montgomery, D. "The Role of the Elementary School Principal in Program Improvement." Review of Educational Research 52 (1982): 309-339.

Licata, Joseph W. "Is the Principal an Effective Change Agent?" NASSP Bulletin (December 1975): 75-81.

Lieberman, A. and Miller, L. "Synthesis of Research on Improving Schools." Educational Leadership, 1981, 38 (7), 583-586.

Loucks, Susan F. "Conceptualing and Measuring Program Implementation: A Variable Useful for Planned Change and Evaluation." Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, March 27, 1978.

Louis, Karen S. "The Role of External Agents in Knowledge Utilization, Problem Solving and Implementation of New Programs in Local School Contexts." 1979 (Mimeographed.)

McIntyre, D. John. "Attitude Change Models--Meaning for Principals" NASSP Bulletin (March 1979): 45-48.

McLaughlin, Mibbrey W., and Marsh, David D. "Staff Development and School Change." Teachers College Record (September 1978): 69-94.

Mamasse, A. Lorrie. "Principals as Leaders of High-Performing Systems." Educational Leadership (February 1984): 42-46.

Mann, Dale. "Soft and Hard Strategies of Change." Teachers College, Columbia University. September 1983.

Mann, D. and Lawrence, J., eds. "Instructionally Effective Schools." Impact on Instructional Improvement, 1981.

Right to Read. "Introduction to Change Agentry: Trainer's Presentation." Project Star. 61-87.

Robinson, Phil Clayton. "What Skills Are Needed by Today's School Leaders." Educational Leadership (October 1977): 15-18.

Rutherford, William L. "The Interventions and Plans Principals Make Wher Facilitating Change." Paper presented at Southwest Educational Research Association annual meeting, Dallas, Texas, 31 January 1981.

Rutherford, William L.; Hall, Gene E.; and Newlove, Beulah W. "Describing the Concerns Principals Have About Facilitating Change." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, March 1982.

Sarason, Seymour B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

SPUR. "Handbook for SPUR." Louisiana: Louisiana State Department of Education, 1983.

Stiegelbauer, S. M., Goldstein, M. and Huling, L. "Through the Eye of the Beholder: On the Use of Qualitative Methods in Data Analysis." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, 1982.

Teddlie, Charles; Falkowski, Carol; Stringfield, S.; Desselle, S.; and Garvue, R. Louisiana School Effectiveness Study: Phase Two. Baton Rouge, Louisiana, State Department of Education 1984.

The Best of ERIC on Educational Management. "The Principal as Change Agent." December 1980.

Thomas, M. W. "A Study of Alternatives in American Education." The Role of the Principal Vol. II. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, 1978.

Tye, Kenneth A. "The Principal as a Change Agent." The National Elementary Principal (February 1970): 41-51.

_____. "The School Principal: Key Man in Educational Change." NASSP Bulletin (May 1972): 77-84.

Wallace, Richard C., Jr. "Each His Own Man: The Role of Adoption Agents in the Implementation of Personalized Teacher Education." Texas University, Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1974.